

I strongly oppose cross ownership of same market TV and newspapers. The situation is desperate enough. What amounts to commercial censorship of news already, in my area, pretty well assures that issues of importance will not be covered at any but a superficial level insufficient to give citizens the information they need to form a responsible judgment. While diversity of ownership doesn't insure coverage, it certainly always allows for the prospect of coverage. Any further concentration of ownership of any kind can only, on balance, make the situation worse. Doesn't the appalling uniformity of news which already exists give you people any pause at all, are you, supposed keepers of the spirit of the first amendment, incapable of embarrassment?

While I'd bet that television news coverage would improve with cross-ownership (how much worse can it get?), I have yet to witness any consolidation that didn't result in a diminishment of breadth of coverage, more bubblegum reporting. It is also difficult to avoid the conclusion that the faraway corporate owners of the media in my area have any interest in local news at all - it's too expensive to produce apparently, considering the need to max the bottom line. But further consolidation represents just more throwing in of the towel.